

Comment on 'Another form of the Klein-Gordon equation'

Andreas Aste

Institut für Theoretische Physik der Universität Basel, Klingelbergstrasse 82, 4056 Basel
Switzerland

August 9, 2001

Abstract

It is shown that the alternative Klein-Gordon equation with positive definite probability density proposed in a letter by M.D. Kostin does not meet the requirements of relativistic (quantum) field theory and therefore does not allow for a meaningful physical interpretation.

PACS code: 11.10.-z

Keywords: Klein-Gordon equation, relativistic field theory.

The alternative formulation of the Klein-Gordon equation [1, 2] proposed by M.D. Kostin reads [3]

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} = +mc^2 \phi + c(\hat{p}\vec{\psi}) \quad (1)$$

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \vec{\psi}}{\partial t} = -mc^2 \vec{\psi} + c\vec{p}\phi \quad , \quad (2)$$

where $\phi(\vec{r}, t)$ and $\vec{\psi}(\vec{r}, t)$ are 'scalar' and 'vector' probability amplitudes, respectively, and $\hat{p} = -i\hbar \vec{\nabla}$. Defining the probability density

$$P = \phi^* \phi + (\vec{\psi}^* \vec{\psi}) \quad (3)$$

and the probability current density

$$\vec{S} = c(\phi^* \vec{\psi} + \phi \vec{\psi}^*) \quad , \quad (4)$$

one readily derives the probability conservation equation

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial t} + \vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{S} = 0 \quad . \quad (5)$$

It is a nice feature of the probability density $P(\vec{r}, t)$ to be positive definite, although it is clear that the non-existence of a positive definite probability density for the Klein-Gordon equation is no more a problem in quantum field theory.

Multiplying (1) with $(i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + mc^2)$ and (2) by $c\hat{p}$ and combining the results, one obtains

$$\hbar^2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} \phi - c^2 \hbar^2 \vec{\nabla}^2 \phi + m^2 c^4 \phi = 0 \quad , \quad (6)$$

i.e. ϕ satisfies the Klein-Gordon equation, but in a similar way one immediately sees that the components of $\vec{\psi}$ fulfil the (non-covariant) equation

$$\hbar^2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} \vec{\psi} - c^2 \hbar^2 \vec{\nabla} (\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{\psi}) + m^2 c^4 \vec{\psi} = 0 \quad . \quad (7)$$

Although the problematic nature of equations (1)-(5) can be uncovered easily, their tempting form sometimes leads to confusion and the equations have even found their way into literature [4]. Furthermore, when the scalar particle described by $(\phi, \vec{\psi})$ is coupled to an electromagnetic potential, different results are obtained as in the case of the Klein-Gordon equation. One must therefore ask if the proposed equations should be treated on an equal footing with the usual Klein-Gordon equation.

We give simple arguments in the following which show that the alternative form of the Klein-Gordon equation is hard to interpret in a meaningful way. Obviously, (1) and (2) can be cast in a Dirac-like form

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Psi = mc^2 \beta \Psi + c(\vec{\alpha} \vec{p}) \Psi \quad , \quad (8)$$

with appropriate matrices β and $\vec{\alpha}$ and the four-component wave function

$$\Psi = \begin{pmatrix} \phi \\ \vec{\psi} \end{pmatrix} \quad , \quad (9)$$

or, using a more compact notation in the following where $\hbar = c = 1$

$$\{i\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu - m\} \Psi(x) = \{\gamma^\mu \hat{P}_\mu - m\} \Psi(x) = 0 \quad . \quad (10)$$

Then it is easy to show by straightforward calculation that matrices $S(\Lambda)$ which relate the wave functions in different coordinates x, x'

$$x'^\mu = \Lambda^\mu_\nu x^\nu \quad , \quad x^\nu = (ct, \vec{r}) \quad , \quad \Lambda^\mu_\rho \gamma^\rho = S^{-1}(\Lambda) \gamma^\mu S(\Lambda) \quad , \quad (11)$$

according to

$$\Psi'(x') = S(\Lambda) \Psi(x) = S(\Lambda) \Psi(\Lambda^{-1} x') \quad , \quad (12)$$

$$\{\gamma^\mu \hat{P}_\mu - m\} \Psi(x) = \{\gamma^\mu \hat{P}'_\mu - m\} \Psi'(x') = 0 \quad (13)$$

exist trivially for rotations, but not for general Lorentz transformations [5].

A severe problem arises when one considers the propagators for the proposed theory. The Dirac equation can be written in an explicit form as follows

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{p}_0 - m & 0 & \hat{p}_3 & \hat{p}_1 - i\hat{p}_2 \\ 0 & \hat{p}_0 - m & \hat{p}_1 + i\hat{p}_2 & -\hat{p}_3 \\ -\hat{p}_3 & -\hat{p}_1 + i\hat{p}_2 & -\hat{p}_0 - m & 0 \\ -\hat{p}_1 - i\hat{p}_2 & \hat{p}_3 & 0 & -\hat{p}_0 - m \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_1 \\ \Psi_2 \\ \Psi_3 \\ \Psi_4 \end{pmatrix}_D = 0 \quad , \quad (14)$$

and by formal inversion of the matrix in (14) the retarded (advanced) propagator can be constructed in momentum space

$$\tilde{S}_{R,A}(p) \sim \frac{\gamma^\mu p_\mu + m}{p^2 - m^2 \pm ip_0 0} \quad (15)$$

which has causal support in real space

$$\text{supp}(S_{R,A}(x)) \subseteq V^\pm \quad , \quad (16)$$

$$V^+ = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^4 | x^2 \geq 0, x^0 \geq 0\} \quad , \quad V^- = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^4 | x^2 \geq 0, x^0 \leq 0\} \quad , \quad (17)$$

a fact which expresses, roughly speaking, the causal structure of the theory [6]. The support property (16) of the tempered distributions $S_{R,A} \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbf{R}^4)$ means that the product $\langle S_{R,A} | f \rangle$ vanishes for all rapidly decreasing test functions in Schwartz space $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{R}^4)$ which have their support outside the forward (backward) light cone. But in the present case, inversion of the differential operator

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{p}_0 - m & -\hat{p}_1 & -\hat{p}_2 & -\hat{p}_3 \\ \hat{p}_1 & -\hat{p}_0 - m & 0 & 0 \\ \hat{p}_2 & 0 & -\hat{p}_0 - m & 0 \\ \hat{p}_3 & 0 & 0 & -\hat{p}_0 - m \end{pmatrix} \quad (18)$$

leads to a result

$$\sim \frac{1}{p^2 - m^2} \begin{pmatrix} p_0 - m & -p_1 & -p_2 & -p_3 \\ p_1 & \frac{-p_0^2 + p_2^2 + p_3^2 + m^2}{p_0 + m} & -\frac{p_1 p_2}{p_0 + m} & -\frac{p_1 p_3}{p_0 + m} \\ p_2 & -\frac{p_1 p_2}{p_0 + m} & \frac{-p_0^2 + p_1^2 + p_3^2 + m^2}{p_0 + m} & -\frac{p_2 p_3}{p_0 + m} \\ p_3 & -\frac{p_1 p_3}{p_0 + m} & \frac{-p_2 p_3}{p_0 + m} & \frac{-p_0^2 + p_1^2 + p_2^2 + m^2}{p_0 + m} \end{pmatrix} \quad , \quad (19)$$

which is in conflict with the requirements of the local structure of quantum field theory due to the non-local operator $\sim (\hat{p}_0 + m)^{-1}$ in the propagator. The description of a scalar particle in the Duffin-Kemmer-Petiau formalism [7, 8, 9] by a five-component wave function is equivalent (at least on the classical level) to the usual Klein-Gordon equation and causes no problems of that kind [10].

References

- [1] O. Klein, Z. Phys. 37 (1926) 895.
- [2] W. Gordon, Z. Phys. 40 (1927) 117.
- [3] M.D. Kostin, Phys. Lett. A (1987) 87.
- [4] V.V. Dvoeglazov, Nuovo Cim. A107 (1994) 1413.
- [5] K. Hencken, *private communication*.
- [6] H. Epstein and V. Glaser, "The Rôle of Locality in Perturbation Theory", Annales Poincaré Phys. Theor. A19 (1973) 211.
- [7] R.J. Duffin, Phys. Rev. 54 (1938) 1114.
- [8] N. Kemmer, Proc. Roy. Soc. A173 (1939) 91.
- [9] G. Petiau, Acad. R. Belg. Cl. Sci. Mém. Collect. 16, no.2 (1936) 8.
- [10] J.T. Lunardi, B.M. Pimentel, R.G. Teixeira, and J.S. Valverde, Phys. Lett. A (2000) 165.